

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Drawings

The Examiner has requested to resubmit Fig. 5. Applicants are submitting herewith a complete set of formal drawings.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-48 are objected to because of certain informalities.

As to claim 1, applicants believe that the current phrase is not informal and request the Examiner to withdraw the objection.

As to claim 30, Applicants believe that “a transmission medium” is proper and request the Examiner to withdraw the objection.

As to claim 38, the objection is not clear. The Examiner has suggested changing the dependency to claim 28; however, claim 38 does depend from claim 28. Applicants respectfully request a clarification of the objection or in alternative request the Examiner to withdraw the objection.

As to the remaining claims, they have been amended per the Examiner’s suggestion.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Claims 1-4,12-17,26-28,38 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eyuboglu (cited no.CE in the IDS) in view of Gelblum et al. USP, 6,088,387 (Gelblum). Applicant respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claims 1, 26, and 45 have been amended to include the allowable limitation as identified by the Examiner. Applicants believe that claims 1, 26, and 45 and those depending therefrom are patentably distinguishable from the combination of cited reference and in condition for allowance.

Claims 5 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eyuboglu (cited no.CE in the IDS) in view of Gelblum et al. USP, 6,088,387 (Gelblum) and Khandani (Shaping of Multi-dimensional Signal Constellations Using a Lookup Table), IEEE. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claim 5 depends from claim 1 and claim 39 depends from claim 26. Claims 1 and 26 have been amended to included the allowable limitation and therefore, claims 5 and 39 are patentably distinguishable from the combination of cited references for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 26 respectively.

Applicant believes this application and the claims herein to be in a condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have further inquiry concerning these matters, please contact the below named attorney for Applicant.

Respectfully submitted,



Abdul Zindani
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 46,091

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(972) 917-5137